(6)

Supreme Court, U.S.
FILED
FEB 25 2002
CLERK

No. 01 1254

In the
Supreme Court of the United States

A BERNHARDT,
Petitioner,
v.

SANTA MONICA COLLEGE ET AL, &
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES ET AL.
Respondents.

On Petition For A Writ Of Certiorari
To The United States Court Of Appeals
For The Ninth Circuit

ADDENDUM FOR
PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI

Angela Bernhardt
PO Box 480509
Los Angeles 90048
California.
Email – Angela_Bernhardt@yahoo.com
Tel (310) 281 3092

Petitioner – In Pro -Per

4 pp

14th February 2002

To The Clerk Of The Court & The United States Supreme Court

There is an error in Question Presented Number 2 and Page number errors in the Table Of Contents. Which are corrected in the following pages.

In addition there was a change of status on 4th February 2002 for a related 9th Circuit case 00-55524 regarding Bernhardt v County Of Los Angeles et al referred to in the question presented on **Page iv**, & on **Page 1** & in the argument on **Page 24,** of the first volume of the petition for writ of certiorari. The change of status is that the case was reversed and remanded.

Angela Bernhardt

Angela Bernhardt Petitioner 14th February 2002

CORRECTION

Page i

The Question Presented is:

2. Whether a federal court must consider pursuant to the full faith and credit statute 28 USCS §1738 the preclusion law of the state in which the prior judgment was rendered and whether the 9th Circuit's refusal to consider the principles of California's preclusion law by holding that a prior Small Claims judgment obtained by default, on a common law claim bars petitioner's state tort claims, and petitioner's subsequent Civil Rights claims, conflicts with the holding of this Court in *Migra vs Warren City School Dist. Bd. of Educ.*, U.S. 465 U.S. 75, 104 S.Ct. 892, 896 (1984), that "a federal court must give to a state-court judgment the same preclusive effect as would be given that judgment under the law of the State in which the judgment was rendered"?

CORRECTION TO THE PAGE NUMBER

Page No x

QUESTIONS PRESENTED----------Page No i---viii
PARTIES TO THE PROCEEDING ix ---------Page No 2-3
STATUTORY PROVISIONS---------- Page No 2-3
PROCEDURAL POSTURE ----------Page No 9-10

CORRECTION TO THE PAGE NUMBER

Page xi

The Small Claims Court is not entitled to
Judicial Immunity for acts taken in the
Clear absence of jurisdiction and for
non judicial Acts ----------Page 20-22

CORRECTION TO THE PAGE NUMBER

Page xi

There is no exception to 28 USC to 28 U.SCS §1738 for Federal Civil rights claims under 42 USC§ 1983, §1985 (2) & (3), and claims under the continuing violation theory for Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972, 86 Stat. 373, as amended, 20 U.S.C. § 1681 et seq. (Title IX),

----------Page No 22 - 23

CORRECTIONS TO TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Page xiv

Chang v Chen F.3d 1293, 1296 (9th Circ1996) is only on page 25.

Conley v Gibson 355 U.S. 41, 45-46, 2 L.Ed 2d 80, 78 S.Ct 99 (1957) is only on page 25.

Eldridge v. Block, 832 F.2d 1132, 1137 (9th Cir. 1987) is only on page 25

Faragher v City of Boca Raton, 524 U.S.775, at 787-89; 118 S. Ct. 2275; 141 L. Ed. 2d 662 (1998) (full version)

Haines v.Kerner, 404 U.S. 519, 521,(1972)page 25 only

Henderson v. Duncan, 779 F.2d 1421 (9th Cir. 86), is only on page, 27

Hishon v. King & Spalding, 467 U.S. 69, 73 (1984) is only on page 25

Meritor Savings Bank, FSB v Vinson et al, 477 U.S. 57;

106 S. Ct. 2399; 91 L. Ed. 2d 49; 1986 (full version)

Monroe v. Pape, 365 U.S. 167 is only on page 18

Pages Nos xxiv to xxvii in 1st Volume concern Volume II - Exhibits from original complaint & Record, & allegations first raised by respondents on appeal.